

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephone interview. An Interview Summary accompanies this response.

Applicants appreciate the recognition of allowable subject matter in the present application.

Applicants hereby add new claims 50-58 which are supported at least by the teachings of Figs. 3 and 4 of the original application and the associated teachings of the specification.

Claims 32-34, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 1-3, 9, 11-14, 20, 21, 23, 28, 32-45, and 47-49 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0046642 A1 to Becker et al. Claims 10 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 for obviousness over Becker in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,075,436 to Shanks et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims.

Referring to the 101 rejection, Applicants have amended claim 32 pursuant to the interview and claim 32 is accordingly believed to recite statutory subject matter as discussed during the interview. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 101 rejection of claim 32.

Referring to independent claim 1, the Office relies upon the teachings of paragraphs 0056-0059 of Becker as teaching the limitations of selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures. However, these teachings are void of any

teachings of regarding a plurality of search procedures. More specifically, these teachings disclose changing the header of an interrogation signal in order to address different groups of tags. However, *only a single search procedure is disclosed where an interrogation signal is emitted and devices having the group address of the header of the signal respond to the emitted interrogation signal.* The changing of the addressing which is used in the same procedure of emitting an interrogation signal and waiting for a response fails to teach the claimed limitations of *selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures.*

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection of claim 1 is in error for at least this reason.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites *selecting the one of the different search procedures using provided identification information regarding the group of wireless identification devices within the wireless communications range.* Becker fails to provide any teachings of use of identification information to select a search procedure as specifically claimed. To the contrary, Becker merely teaches including a group of addresses in the header corresponding to the group of devices to be searched which fails to disclose the above-recited selecting limitations let alone selecting using provided identification information.

Applicants respectfully submit the 102 rejection of claim 1 is in error for at least the above-mentioned numerous reasons.

Referring to independent claim 12, the use of different group addresses of devices within the header of an interrogation signal as disclosed in Becker pertain to a single search procedure (i.e., emitting an interrogation signal and processing

responses). Becker is *void of teachings regarding a plurality of search procedures* and accordingly Becker fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of *selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures* in combination with *identifying a wireless identification device using the selected one of the search procedures* as specifically claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 12 is allowable for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 12 recites *selecting the one of the different search procedures using the identifyings of the first and the second of the wireless identification devices*. Becker teaches including a group of addresses in the header corresponding to the group of devices to be searched and Becker fails to teach *selection of one of different search procedures using the identifyings of the first and second devices* as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit the 102 rejection of claim 12 is in error for at least the above-mentioned numerous reasons.

Referring to independent claim 20, Becker fails to teach or suggest a plurality of search procedures and accordingly Becker fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the *processing circuitry configured to select one of a plurality of search procedures* in combination with *identifying at least one of the wireless identification devices using the selected search procedure*.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection of claim 20 is in error for at least this reason.

Furthermore, the mere inclusion of the group address of the group of devices to be identified within the header of the interrogation signal as taught by Becker fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations reciting that the *processing circuitry is*

*configured to analyze a number of wireless identification devices which may be present within the wireless communications range with respect to the range of identifiers of the devices which may be present within the wireless communications range and to select the one of the search procedures using the analysis.*

Applicants respectfully request identification of the explicit teachings of Becker relied upon as allegedly teachings the claimed analysis of claim 20 if claim 20 is not allowed so Applicants may appropriately respond. The mere statement of “group address” on page 6 of the Office Action referring to paragraph 0048 of Becker fails to disclose the claimed analysis recited in claim 20.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 20 is allowable for at least the above-mentioned compelling reasons.

Referring to claim 32, Becker fails to teach or suggest a plurality of different search procedures and Becker fails to disclose the claimed limitations of *selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures, wherein the different search procedures comprise procedures for identifying unidentified ones of the wireless identification devices* as explicitly claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 32 is allowable for at least this reason.

Furthermore, claim 32 recites *accessing information regarding a plurality of wireless identification devices which may be within a wireless communications range of the wireless communications reader and selecting the one of the different search procedures using the accessed information*. Becker merely discloses changing the group address in the header of the interrogation signal which fails to teach or suggest

the claimed accessing information let alone the selecting using the accessed information as positively-claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is allowable for at least the above-mentioned compelling reasons.

The pending dependent claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the respective independent claims from which they depend as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 15, 2010

By: /James D. Shaurette/  
James D. Shaurette  
Reg. No. 39,833